

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary		Application No. 10/563,696	Applicant(s) DIOGUARDI ET AL.
Examiner ATIBA O. FITZPATRICK		Art Unit 2624	

All Participants:

(1) ATIBA O. FITZPATRICK.

(2) Gregory A. Sebald.

Date of Interview: 17 February 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☒ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Status of Application: Allowed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 11:00 am

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
 NA

Claims discussed:
 1, 6, 8, 13, 17, 18, 19, 21, 26, 31, and 34

Prior art documents discussed:
 NA

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/A. O. F./

Examiner, Art Unit 2624

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner indicated that the application was close to being in condition for allowance, except for 35 USC 112 second paragraph deficiencies that were discovered in the claims listed above. In the limitations present in the original independent claim 1, and the analogous limitations from claim 1 that were included in the amended dependent claims listed above, the examiner noticed the following deficiencies: On line 4 of claim 1, "quantization of the images" included the phrase "the images", which has insufficient antecedent basis. The examiner suggested this phrase being changed to "the digital images". Line 10 of claim 1 includes the limitations "the overall image", and the examiner suggested that this phrase be changed to "an overall image". The foregoing changes must also be made in the dependent claims listed above (that were treated in the first action), since limitations from the original claim 1 have been inserted into these depending claims. Also, amended claim 1 includes limitations that were originally included in the cancelled claim 2. Therefore, line 13 of amended claim 1 includes the limitations "the image", which must be changed to "each image of the digital images". Analogous changes must be made to the dependent claims listed above. That is, where appropriate limitations indicating a plurality of images must be changed to indicate a plurality of digital images, and limitations indicating a single image must be changed to indicate each image of the digital images. Applicant agreed that these changes should be made and granted the examiner the permission to make these changes via Examiner's Amendment. The reader is referred to the Examiner's Amendment for specificity.